

SCOTT BATCHELDER – MARCH 25, 2010

Plaintiff's Rebuttal Designations:

- Pg. 51 ln. 8 - pg. 52, ln. 19
- Pg. 53, ln. 3 - pg. 54, ln. 17

JON BYRD – MARCH 3, 2010

Plaintiff's Objection:

- Pg. 32, ln. 7-12: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

Plaintiff's Optional Completeness Designations:

- Pg. 32, lns. 13-16 (only if the above objection is overruled)
- Pg. 57, lns. 2-4

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designations:

- Pg. 24, ln. 25 - pg. 25, ln. 13

GERARD CALDWELL – MARCH 26, 2010

Plaintiff's Optional Completeness Designation:

- Pg. 23, lns. 19-24

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designation:

- Pg. 88, lns. 2-21

WILLIAM CHUNG-JULY 1, 2010

Plaintiff's Objections:

- Pg. 13, lns. 7-17: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

- Pg. 14, lns. 9-16: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

- Pg. 30, ln. 1 - pg. 31, ln. 18: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602. This testimony is also based upon inadmissible hearsay evidence under Rules 801 and 802.

- Pg. 37, lns. 5-11: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

- Pg. 64, ln. 8 - pg. 65, ln. 16: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

- Pg. 65, ln 19 - pg. 67, ln 21: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

- Pg. 67, ln. 23 - pg. 69, ln. 15: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

- Pg. 77, ln. 16 - p. 78, ln. 11: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602. Plaintiff further objects to this testimony, because there is no admissible evidence showing that the 957 Base Plate was shown at any trade show.

- Pg. 80, lns. 22-25: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

Plaintiff's Optional Completeness Designations:

- Pg. 9, lns. 20-23
- Pg. 13, lns. 18-19
- Pg. 27, ln. 21 - pg. 28, ln. 4
- Pg. 31, lns. 21-23 (if objection is overruled)
- Pg. 74, lns. 3-8

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designation:

- Pg. 12, lns. 9-13
- Pg. 91, lns. 12-19
- Pg. 93, ln. 6 - pg. 100, ln. 6

THANG DANG – MARCH 2, 2010

Plaintiff's Optional Completeness Designation:

- Pg. 33, ln. 24 - Pg. 34, ln. 6

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designations:

- Pg. 38, lns. 19-21
- Pg. 50, lns. 19-22 (to “the supplier”)
- Pg. 88, ln. 19 - pg. 89, ln. 7
- Pg. 157, lns. 9-11
- Pg. 209, lns. 1-3
- Pg. 212, lns. 4-13

ROCIO ECHEVERRIA – MARCH 24, 2010

Plaintiff's Objection:

- Pg. 51, ln. 25 - pg. 52, ln. 4: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designations:

- Pg. 66, lns. 4-15

TOM HARDESTY – MAY 14, 2010

Plaintiff's Objection:

- Pg. 14, ln. 14 - pg. 15, ln. 11: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 15, lns. 12-14: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 15, ln. 23 - pg. 16, ln. 14: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 17, lns. 5-9: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 20, lns. 5-25: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 46, ln. 23- pg. 47, ln. 8: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designation:

- Pg. 63, lns. 11 - pg. 64, ln. 25
- Pg. 66, lns. 11-14

STEVEN JERSEY – MARCH 3, 2010

Plaintiff's Objection:

- Pg. 131, lns. 3-12: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

Plaintiff's Optional Completeness Designations:

- Pg. 12, lns. 14-23
- Pg. 16, lns. 2-6

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designation:

- Pg. 170, lns. 6-11, 17-19

RUSSELL JOHNSON – APRIL 2, 2010

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designations:

- Pg. 41, ln. 8 - pg. 42, ln. 2

JAY NAVAL – MARCH 4, 2010

Plaintiff's Objections:

- Pg. 36, lns. 16-24: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602. This testimony is also based upon inadmissible hearsay evidence under Rules 801 and 802.
- Pg. 83, lns. 6-19: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.
- Pg. 86, lns. 9-12: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

MICHAEL SAVELIEV – MARCH 4, 2010

Plaintiff's Objection:

- Pg. 127, lns. 14-16, 19-22: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

MICHAEL SAVELIEV – MAY 14, 2010

Plaintiff's Objection:

- Pg. 244, ln. 20 - pg. 245, ln. 12: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.
- Pg. 245, ln. 16 - pg. 246, ln. 9: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 247, ln. 19 - pg. 248, ln. 22: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 249, ln. 2 - pg. 249, ln. 10: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 252, ln. 9 - pg. 252, ln. 21: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 253, ln. 24 - pg. 254, ln. 25: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 263, ln. 24 - pg. 264, ln. 12: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 264, ln. 20 - pg. 265, ln. 4: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 267, ln. 6 - pg. 267, ln 10: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

- Pg. 268, ln. 6 - pg. 268. ln. 13: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

MICHAEL SAVELIEV – JULY 1, 2010

Plaintiff's Objection:

- Pg. 137, ln. 19 -pg. 143, ln. 4: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602. This testimony is also based upon inadmissible hearsay evidence under Rules 801 and 802.

- Pg. 146, lns. 1-2: Plaintiff objects to this designation, as it is incomplete and confusing.

- Pg. 155, lns. 1-13: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602. This testimony is also based upon inadmissible hearsay evidence under Rules 801 and 802.

- Pg. 164, lns. 16-17: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff. In addition, Defendants have violated the Court's restriction of discovery to topics related to Defendants' new claims regarding the '936 Patent.

- Pg. 165, lns. 3-9: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff. In addition, Defendants have violated the Court's restriction of discovery to topics related to Defendants' new claims regarding the '936 Patent.

- Pg. 166, lns. 5-7: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this

testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff. In addition, Defendants have violated the Court's restriction of discovery to topics related to Defendants' new claims regarding the '936 Patent.

- Pg. 207, lns. 9-17: Plaintiff objects to this testimony, because there is no admissible evidence showing that the 957 Base Plate was shown at any trade show.

Plaintiff's Optional Completeness Designations:

- Pg. 19, lns. 8-14
- Pg. 113, lns. 17-20
- Pg. 114, ln. 14- Pg. 115, ln. 7

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designation:

- Pg. 12, ln. 18 - pg. 13, ln. 8
- Pg. 19, ln. 22 - pg. 21, ln. 5
- Pg. 43, ln. 11 - pg. 44, ln. 15
- Pg. 91 ln. 1 - pg. 92, ln. 9
- Pg. 93, ln. 14 - pg. 94, ln. 12
- Pg. 95, lns. 9-21
- Pg. 96, lns. 1-13
- Pg. 98, lns. 2-25
- Pg. 108, ln. 7 - pg. 109, ln. 4
- Pg. 129, ln. 15 - pg. 132, ln. 4
- Pg. 156, ln. 5-18
- Pg. 157, lns. 6-16

JEFF SCHOPPERLE – MARCH 24, 2010

Plaintiff's Objection:

- Pg. 64, lns. 5-21: Plaintiff objects to this testimony under Rules 402 and 403. This testimony is not relevant to any issues before the jury. Furthermore, the introduction of this testimony would unfairly prejudice Plaintiff.

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designations:

- Pg 37, ln. 15- pg. 39, ln. 4

RYAN SESSLER – MARCH 24, 2010

Plaintiff's Objections:

- Pg. 86, lns. 11-23: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.
- Pg. 87, lns. 3-6: The witness does not have personal knowledge, and thus, his testimony is inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 602.

STEVE TILDERS – MARCH 21, 2010

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal Designations:

- Pg. 61, ln. 10-21

Dated: August 9, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mary-Olga Lovett

Michael A. Nicodema, admitted *pro hac vice*

Attorney in Charge

nicodemam@gtlaw.com

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

200 Park Avenue

PO Box 677

Florham Park, New Jersey 07932

973-360-7900

973-301-8410 fax

Mary-Olga Lovett

Paul J. Brown

lovettm@gtlaw.com

brownpa@gtlaw.com

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 1800

Houston, Texas 77002

Gerald L. Fellows, admitted *pro hac vice*

fellowsj@gtlaw.com

Kimberly A. Warshawsky, admitted *pro hac vice*

warshawskyk@gtlaw.com

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

2375 East Camelback Road, Suite 700

Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Telephone: (602) 445-8000

Telecopier: (602) 445-8100

Douglas R. McSwane, Jr.

State Bar No 1381300

POTTER MINTON

A Professional Corporation

110 N. College, Suite 500 (75702)

P. O. Box 359

Tyler, Texas 75710

(903) 597 8311

(903) 593 0846 (Facsimile)

dougmcswane@potterminton.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

STA-RITE INDUSTRIES, LLC F/K/A

SHURFLO, LLC F/K/A SHURFLO PUMP

MANUFACTURING COMPANY

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that all counsel of record who are deemed to consented to electronic service and being served with a copy of this document via the Court's e-filing system on August 9, 2010.

By: /s/ Mary-Olga Lovett
Mary-Olga Lovett